

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT TACOMA

9 RICKEY CALHOUN,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 PETER ROBINSON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. C08-5744 RJB/KLS

ADDITIONAL ORDER REGARDING  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL  
(DKT. 31)

13 On October 13, 2009, the court issued an Order addressing Plaintiff's motion (Dkt. 31) to  
14 compel production of documents. Dkt. 70. With regard to Plaintiff's request for the production  
15 of Defendants' personnel files (RFP 1), the court requested additional briefing from Defendants  
16 on the issue of whether their personnel files are within their "control." Dkt. 70, pp. 5-6.  
17 Defendants have provided the additional briefing requested by the court. Dkt. 75. After  
18 reviewing the additional briefing, and balance of the record, the Court finds and orders as  
19 follows:  
20

21 Plaintiff's RFP 1 requests "Defendants' personnel files, including promotions, demotions,  
22 complaints, any SCC/DSHS investigations, findings, sanctions, reasons for administrative leaves,  
23 reasons for termination or resignation, and any other documents relating to their employment  
24 history at SCC." Defendants concede that they have a right to demand their personnel files from  
25 their employer, but argue that the Plaintiff's request should be denied or strictly limited to  
26

1 documents in their personnel file that are relevant to the very limited claim at issue. Dkt. 75, p.  
2 2.

3       Discovery may not be obtained regarding matters that are privileged. Fed. R. Civ. P.  
4 26(b)(1). A state employee's personnel file is privileged under the State public records act.  
5 *Dawson v. Daly*, 120 Wn.2d 782, 845 P.2d 554 (1995) (court rejected release of employee's  
6 personnel file), disagreed with on other grounds in *Progressive Animal Welfare Soc. v.*  
7 *University of Washington*, 125 Wn.2d 243, 884 P.2d 592 (1994); *Beltran v. DSHS*, 98 Wn. App.  
8 245, 989 P.2d 604 (1999) (social worker's personnel file protected from disclosure except for  
9 such information materially relating to the matters contained in the lawsuit). Although generally  
10 questions of privilege in civil rights cases brought under federal statutes are resolved by federal  
11 law, federal courts should not wholly ignore state laws. *Kelly v. City of San Jose*, 114 F.R.D.  
12 653, 655 (N.D. Cal. 1987). "Rather, it is appropriate for the court to conduct a balancing test,  
13 slightly pre-weighted in favor of disclosure, balancing the public interest in disclosure against the  
14 interest of maintaining the security of the prison, its staff and inmates as well as the defendant's  
15 right to privacy." *See Kelly*, 114 F.R.D. at 661-663.

16       Plaintiffs' claims that these defendants retaliated against him with regard to two requests  
17 for urinalyses (UAs) and his placement in the Direct Testing Program when he refused to submit  
18 to the January 23, 2008 UA. Therefore, the court agrees, in general, that materials related to the  
19 defendants' promotions and demotions; complaints; SCC/DSHS investigations, findings, and  
20 sanctions; their reasons for administrative leaves; their reasons for termination or resignation;  
21 and "any other documents relating to their employment history at SCC" are not all relevant to  
22 Plaintiff's claims. However, to the extent the personnel files contain performance evaluations,  
23 investigations, findings, sanctions and/or other documents relating to specific instances of  
24  
25  
26

1 misconduct by the Defendants, then such documents should be produced. *See Dawson v. Daly*,  
2 120 W.2d 782, 845 P.2d 544 (1995)(performance evaluations that do not relate to specific  
3 instances of misconduct are not subject to disclosure).

4 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for the production of Defendants' personnel files (Dkt.  
5 31) is **GRANTED as to documents in the personnel files that relate to specific instances of**  
6 **misconduct** by the Defendants, if any.

7  
8 DATED this 23rd day of November, 2009.

9  
10  
11   
12 Karen L. Strombom  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26